

R E M A R K S

I. Introduction

In response to the Decision on Appeal of January 29, 2010, Applicants have amended claim 2. In addition, new claim 7 has been added. Support for the amendment of claim 2 may be found, for example, in paragraphs [0051], [0055] and [0064] of the specification. Support for new claim 7 may be found, for example, in claim 2 and in paragraph [0061] of the specification. Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been cancelled, without prejudice. No new matter has been added. For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are patentable over the cited prior art references.

II. The Rejection Of Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyamoto et al. (USP No. 6,744,895) in view of Han et al. (US 2002/0071590). As claims 1, 5 and 6 have been cancelled, the rejection of these claims is moot. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

With regard to the present disclosure, amended claim 2 recites, in-part, a loudspeaker comprising a first diaphragm whose outer periphery is fixed to an upper opening of a frame and a second diaphragm whose outer periphery is fixed to a lower opening of the frame. The frame is integrated with an outer peripheral part of a connected-component which is formed by coupling the yoke with the first magnet and the first plate. The frame is molded of a resin and the connected-component is integrated by using insert-molding with a reference plane of an upper surface of the yoke.

One feature of amended claim 2 is that the frame is molded of a resin and the connected-component is integrated by using insert-molding with a reference plane of an upper surface of the yoke. As a result of this feature, the quality of the loudspeaker can be kept high. In addition, because yoke 3A is integrated with frame 1C by insert-molding, conventional protruded section 1A, which is coupled with yoke 3, of an inner wall of frame 1 becomes unnecessary at frame 1C.

In a loudspeaker which is employed as a receiver used by making the operator's ear close to the receiver, the operator recognizes variations in sound-pressure frequency characteristics. Therefore, such a problem can be avoided by using the loudspeaker of a side of second diaphragm as a receiver. As such, new claim 7 features that the loudspeaker on the second diaphragm side is used as a receiver.

Another feature of both claim 2 and claim 7 is that both disclose the use of two diaphragms.

In contrast to the present invention, neither Miyamoto nor Han disclose the use of insert molding for integrating the frame with the connected component. Nor does the combination of the two references result in such a feature. Neither Miyamoto nor Han disclose integration molding. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Miyamoto and Han fails to disclose all of the limitations of amended claim 2.

In order to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA1974). As Miyamoto and Han, at a minimum, fail to describe a loudspeaker having a frame being molded of a resin and the connected-component is integrated by using insert-molding with a reference plane of an upper surface of the yoke, it is submitted that Miyamoto,

alone or in combination with Han, does not render claim 2 obvious. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the § 103 rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Furthermore, new claim 7 similarly recites a loud speaker having a loudspeaker on a side of the second diaphragm used as a receiver.

Neither Miyamoto nor Han disclose the use of a loudspeaker of a side of the second diaphragm is used as a receiver. Accordingly, Applicants submit that new claim 7 is allowable over the cited prior art as well.

III. Conclusion

Having fully responded to all matters raised in the Office Action, Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, an indication of which is respectfully solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP


for Michael E. Fogarty
Registration No. 36,139

Res No 53,308

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 MEF:NDM
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 29, 2010

**Please recognize our Customer No. 53080
as our correspondence address.**